

Remarks

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-33, 35-41, 43-67, 69-78, and 80-96 are in the application. Claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78 are in independent form. Reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner objects to the title as not being descriptive. Applicants have amended to title to "Data Output Method for Rendering Data Content Accessed from a Mobile Information Apparatus" to more closely reflect the claimed subject matter.

Claims 10 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. Claims 10 and 42 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 13, 34, 45, 68, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lo et al. [US 5,911,044; hereinafter Lo]. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-33, 35-44, 46-67, 68-78, and 80-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. [US 6,553,431; hereinafter Yamamoto].

Applicants respond as follows.

Independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78 have been amended to recite a mobile information apparatus and that the communication channel includes a radio frequency wireless communication channel at the mobile information apparatus. Claims 2, 34, 42, and 68 have been cancelled as being redundant and various dependent claims have been amended for consistency.

Lo describes a system and method for performing scanning operations using a scanner connected to a server computer and transmitting acquired images from the scanner server to a client computer. As illustrated in Fig. 2, a client computer 102, a scanner server computer 130, and file server computer are connected to a computer network 120. A scanner 144 is connected to the scanner server computer 130 "via a bus or cable 140." (Lo, col. 5, lines 47-55.) Lo further states that the computer network 120 may use a wireless network. (Lo, col. 6, lines 24-26.)

Yamamoto is directed to a multifunction device, such as one having a scanner that is connected to multiple output devices (e.g., printer, fax machine). As noted by the Examiner, Yamada fails to teach a method in which the communication channel includes a wireless communication channel. (Office action, page 4, lines 1 and 2)

Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, and 78, and their dependent claims, are patentably distinct from the cited references. Neither Lo nor Yamamoto teaches or suggests a data output method that employs a radio frequency wireless communication channel between a mobile information apparatus and one or more output devices. Both references are directed to connecting a scanner to a computer network or system. Both references employ a wired connection between the scanner and the computer network or system. As a result, the wired scanners of Lo and Yamamoto function as immobile input devices that are distinct from the mobile information apparatuses recited in the claims. Applicants request, therefore, that the rejections for anticipation by Lo and Yamamoto be withdrawn.

Moreover, applicants submit that the references fail to even suggest the claimed subject matter. The wired systems of Lo and Yamamoto are narrowly directed to scanner-type input devices, which are distinct in functionality from the pervasive mobile information apparatuses of the present invention. Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

IPSOLOL LLP  
805 SW BROADWAY #2740  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97205  
TEL. (503) 249-7066  
FAX (503) 249-7068

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark M. Meininger  
Registration No. 32,428